

PLEASE CLICK ON THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES SEAL  
TO RETURN TO THIS PAGE

[50-D: CLICK HERE FOR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT DATED JUNE 2, 2016](#)

[50-A: CLICK HERE FOR THE INTERIM DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH'S REPORT DATED JUNE 17, 2016](#)

[50-C: CLICK HERE FOR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT DATED SEPTEMBER 27, 2016](#)



SACHI A. HAMAI  
Chief Executive Officer

## County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration  
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012  
(213) 974-1101  
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

June 2, 2016

To: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, Chair  
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas  
Supervisor Sheila Kuehl  
Supervisor Don Knabe  
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: Sachi A. Hamai  
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors  
HILDA L. SOLIS  
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS  
Second District

SHEILA KUEHL  
Third District

DON KNABE  
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH  
Fifth District

### **DEPLOYMENT STRATEGY/PLAN TO INCREASE PATROL SERVICES IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS (ITEM NO. 50, AGENDA OF APRIL 12, 2016)**

On April 12, 2016, the Board directed the Chief Executive Office (CEO) to report back during Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17 Final Changes Budget with a deployment strategy/plan to increase patrol deputies in the unincorporated areas (UA). Further, the Board requested that the Sheriff's Department (Department) deployment strategy/plan give substantial weight to the areas with the highest crime rates understanding that the Department must prioritize deployment based on a number of factors including response times, workload, geographic terrain, and other factors.

### **Background**

On September 29, 2015, during FY 2015-16 Supplemental Budget, the Board approved a motion directing the Chief Executive Officer to report back with the necessary funds, which could be set aside in Provisional Financing Uses (PFU), to implement Phase II of UA patrol services (consisting of 56 deputies) at such time that the Department is able to increase patrol services in the UA. Accordingly, the CEO set aside funding in PFU for this purpose as part of the FY 2016-17 Recommended Budget.

The Department has recently reviewed Phase II of UA patrol services to determine whether any adjustments should be made and concluded that the 56 deputies are still required in order to meet the public safety needs in the UA. However, given the existing vacancies in the Department, particularly in custody operations, and the length of time it

*"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"*

**Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are Two-Sided  
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only**

takes to recruit and hire sworn personnel, the Department is proposing to implement a deployment plan on a phased-in approach.

### **Deployment Strategy/Implementation Plan**

Using the criteria requested by the Board, the Department consulted with Station Commanders and Department Executives regarding the deployment of deputies assigned to the UA. After further consideration, the Department has agreed to provide substantial weight to the areas with the highest crime rates. The Department also considered, as recommended in the Board motion, response times, geographic terrain and workload to assist in developing the most effective deployment schedule for the UA. In addition, variables such as the number of homicides, gang-related shootings, and assaults, including the deployment of Summer Crime Enforcement Program deputies in the area, were considered.

Based on the aforementioned, the Department proposes the following Deployment/Implementation Plan:

<b>Deputy Sheriff Movement</b>			
<b>Movement Date</b>	<b>Number of Deputies</b>	<b>Station</b>	<b>Supervisory District</b>
07/03/16	2	East Los Angeles	First
09/25/16	2	Santa Clarita	Fifth
11/06/16	2	Century	First and Second
01/29/17	2	Malibu/Lost Hills	Third and Fifth
04/16/17	2	Industry	First and Fourth
06/13/17	2	Crescenta Valley	Fifth

Effective July 3, 2016, the Department proposes deploying a minimum of 12 deputies (assigned to a 40-hour work week, with no relief) to six different stations. The deployment will assign two deputies to a patrol station every other month, following predetermined deputy transfer dates. According to the Department, this deployment plan was primarily based on 2015 data; however preliminary data from 2016 was also reviewed. The sworn personnel vacancies will be monitored continuously and as the situation improves, the Department will consider adding deputies consistent with the Department's UA Assessment of 2014 – Phase II Deployment Plan.

UA Personnel Staffing charts are included providing a side-by-side comparison between 2014 versus 2015, and 2015 versus 2016 (Attachments I and II).

The Department has also provided the following quantitative data:

- Part I and II crimes per station (Attachment III);
- Response times per station (Attachment IV); and
- Calls per deputy (Attachment V).

These factors were ranked from 1 (highest number of crimes, response times, and/or calls) to 20 (lowest number of crimes, response times, and/or calls). A matrix that reflects deployment of Summer Crime Enforcement Program deputies was also provided (Attachment VI) as this program serves the UA; a factor that should also be considered.

While the Department is committed to this deployment plan, the data used to develop the plan is dynamic. If crime patterns, response times, workload or personnel significantly change, modifications to the plan may be required. The Department will brief each Board Office's respective Field Deputies prior to any such modifications.

### **Costs/Financing**

The estimated cost for the deployment of 12 deputies, on a phased-in basis, is \$1.447 million in FY 2016-17. As part of the FY 2016-17 Recommended Budget, one-time funding has been set aside in PFU for this program.

### **Options**

- A. Transfer \$1.447 million in one-time funds from PFU to the Department's budget to offset FY 2016-17 costs. At the end of the fiscal year, the Department will return to the Board with a request to fund the subsequent years.
  - If Option A is selected, the Department will deploy 12 deputies, on an overtime basis, as funding is one-time in nature. In addition, the deployment would be considered a temporary enhancement to the UA.
- B. Transfer \$1.447 million in one-time funds from PFU to the Department's budget to offset the salary and employee benefits of 12 deputies, services and supplies, and equipment costs required in FY 2016-17. The Department will require an estimated \$3.406 million in ongoing and \$491,000 in one-time funds for a total of \$3.897 million in FY 2017-18 to continue the program.

- If Option B is selected, the CEO will need to identify an ongoing funding source for the 12 deputies, inclusive of a relief factor, as part of FY 2017-18 Recommended Budget.

### **CEO Recommendation**

In order to meet the public safety needs of the UA, the CEO recommends Option B. Option B not only ensures continuity of service, but provides the Department with the required ongoing resources it needs to reduce response times and provide officer visibility in the community, which is an effective deterrent to criminal activity. In addition, the Department is committed to staffing UA Patrol upon availability of funds.

### **Conclusion**

Going forward, it is further recommended that the Department provide the Board with a year-end status report on the Department's Sworn Vacancies beginning with FY 2016-17. At that time, the Board can consider adding deputies to the UA consistent with the Department's UA Assessment of 2014 – Phase II Deployment Plan.

SAH:JJ:SW  
JV:cc

### **Attachments**

c:     Executive Office, Board of Supervisors  
        County Counsel  
        Sheriff

## 2014/2015 UA Personnel Staffing

North Patrol Division	DSG/B-1 Patrol UA		
Station	2014	2015	Difference
Lancaster	28.18	33.18	5
Malibu/Lost Hills	8.92	11.92	3
Palmdale	29.75	34.75	5
Santa Clarita	30.34	33.34	3
West Hollywood*	16.30	24.30	8
<b>Total:</b>	<b>113.49</b>	<b>137.49</b>	<b>24</b>

Central Patrol Division	DSG/B-1 Patrol UA		
Station	2014	2015	Difference
Avalon	2.33	4.33	2
Century	87.70	91.70	4
Compton	27.23	29.23	2
East Los Angeles	53.79	56.79	3
Marina Del Rey	38.00	41.00	3
South Los Angeles	58.35	60.35	2
<b>Total:</b>	<b>267.40</b>	<b>283.4</b>	<b>16</b>

South Patrol Division	DSG/B-1 Patrol UA		
Station	2014	2015	Difference
Carson	23.16	30.16	7
Cerritos	0.00	0.00	0
Lakewood	0.12	0.12	0
Lomita	2.30	2.30	0
Norwalk	22.98	25.98	3
Pico Rivera	18.62	20.62	2
<b>Total:</b>	<b>67.18</b>	<b>79.18</b>	<b>12</b>

East Patrol Division	DSG/B-1 Patrol UA		
Station	2014	2015	Difference
Altadena	26.31	29.31	3
Crescenta Valley	13.29	16.29	3
Industry	47.35	51.35	4
San Dimas	34.47	38.47	4
Temple	25.81	29.81	4
Walnut	23.18	26.18	3
<b>Total:</b>	<b>170.41</b>	<b>191.41</b>	<b>21</b>

<b>Department Totals</b>	<b>618.48</b>	<b>691.48</b>	<b>73</b>
--------------------------	---------------	---------------	-----------

\* West Hollywood UA received six additional deputy items due to the Universal CityWalk annexation project effective September 1, 2015.

## 2015/2016 UA Personnel Staffing

North Patrol Division		DSG/B-1 Patrol UA	
Station	2015	2016	Difference
Lancaster	33.18		33.18
Malibu/Lost Hills	11.92	2.00	13.92
Palmdale	34.75		34.75
Santa Clarita	33.34	2.00	35.34
West Hollywood*	24.30		24.30
<b>Total:</b>	<b>137.49</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>141.49</b>

Central Patrol Division		DSG/B-1 Patrol UA	
Station	2015	2016	Difference
Avalon	4.33		4.33
Century	91.70	2.00	93.70
Compton	29.23		29.23
East Los Angeles	56.79	2.00	58.79
Marina Del Rey	41.00		41.00
South Los Angeles	60.35		60.35
<b>Total:</b>	<b>283.4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>287.4</b>

South Patrol Division		DSG/B-1 Patrol UA	
Station	2015	2016	Difference
Carson	30.16		30.16
Cerritos	0.00		0.00
Lakewood	0.12		0.12
Lomita	2.30		2.30
Norwalk	25.98		25.98
Pico Rivera	20.62		20.62
<b>Total:</b>	<b>79.18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>79.18</b>

East Patrol Division		DSG/B-1 Patrol UA	
Station	2015	2016	Difference
Altadena	29.31		29.31
Crescenta Valley	16.29	2.00	18.29
Industry	51.35	2.00	53.35
San Dimas	38.47		38.47
Temple	29.81		29.81
Walnut	26.18		26.18
<b>Total:</b>	<b>191.41</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>195.41</b>

<b>Department Totals</b>	<b>691.48</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>703.48</b>
--------------------------	---------------	-----------	---------------

\* West Hollywood UA received six additional deputy items due to the Universal CityWalk annexation project effective September 1, 2015.



2015 Part I and Part II Crimes		
Stations	Part 1 & Part II Crimes per Deputy	Part I & Part II Crimes Rank
East Los Angeles	54.12	1
Norwalk	45.872	2
South Los Angeles	43.552	3
Industry	42.666	4
Century	39.138	5
Pico Rivera	37.83	6
Walnut	34.556	7
Santa Clarita	33.368	8
Temple	31.786	9
Lost Hills/Malibu	30.6	10
Carson	29.026	11
Altadena	27.912	12
Compton	23.752	13
Marina del Rey	20.662	14
Palmdale	20.14	15
Crescenta Valley	19.704	16
Lancaster	18.62	17
San Dimas	18.366	18
West Hollywood*	8.922	19
Avalon*	2.632	20

Part I and Part II Crimes - Ranked from 1 (highest number of crimes handled per deputy to 20 (least number of crimes handled per deputy).

\*Due to the unique dispatching communication component at Avalon and West Hollywood stations, both stations are considered as outliers. They do not get dispatched to calls in the same ways as the other stations, because a majority of their deployments are foot beats, so when a deputy gets a call on a foot beat they do not have MDC computers with them, so in most cases they have to manually input the time of calls, which is different than the other stations. Also in West Hollywood, some calls for service are generated by citizens sharing information with a security guard that has a Sheriff's radio, so deputies respond to the call and then go back later and enter the estimated times that generate response times.



2015 Response Time		
Stations	Emergent Response Time	Emergent Response Time Rank
Crescenta Valley	9.8	1
Lost Hills/Malibu	9.8	2
West Hollywood*	9.8	3
Palmdale	9.3	4
Lancaster	8.6	5
Santa Clarita	7.7	6
San Dimas	6.9	7
Marina del Rey	5.9	8
Temple	5.5	9
Compton	4.7	10
Carson	4.6	11
Industry	4.6	12
Century	4.3	13
Walnut	4.2	14
East Los Angeles	4.1	15
Norwalk	4	16
Pico Rivera	4	17
South Los Angeles	3.7	18
Altadena	3.5	19
Avalon*	0	20

Emergent Response Time - Ranked from 1 (longest response time to location) to 20 (shortest response time to location).

\*Due to the unique dispatching communication component at Avalon and West Hollywood stations, both stations are considered as outliers. They do not get dispatched to calls in the same ways as the other stations, because a majority of their deployments are foot beats, so when a deputy gets a call on a foot beat they do not have MDC computers with them, so in most cases they have to manually input the time of calls, which is different than the other stations. Also in West Hollywood, some calls for service are generated by citizens sharing information with a security guard that has a Sheriff's radio, so deputies respond to the call and then go back later and enter the estimated times that generate response times.



2015 Calls for Service		
Stations	Calls for Service per Deputy	Calls for Service Rank
Norwalk	666.9	1
Temple	653.67	2
East Los Angeles	630.92	3
Industry	590.59	4
Altadena	454.45	5
Walnut	418.37	6
Pico Rivera	415.71	7
South Los Angeles	412.23	8
Carson	379.01	9
Lancaster	361.75	10
San Dimas	342.89	11
Century	340.69	12
Santa Clarita	305.22	13
Palmdale	282.33	14
Marina del Rey	279.63	15
Crescenta Valley	278.21	16
Lost Hills/Malibu	276.68	17
Compton	271.09	18
Avalon*	9.47	19
West Hollywood*	6.75	20

Calls for Service - Ranked from 1 (highest volume of calls handled per deputy) to 20 (least number of calls handled per deputy).

\*Due to the unique dispatching communication component at Avalon and West Hollywood stations, both stations are considered as outliers. They do not get dispatched to calls in the same ways as the other stations, because a majority of their deployments are foot beats, so when a deputy gets a call on a foot beat they do not have MDC computers with them, so in most cases they have to manually input the time of calls, which is different than the other stations. Also in West Hollywood, some calls for service are generated by citizens sharing information with a security guard that has a Sheriff's radio, so deputies respond to the call and then go back later and enter the estimated times that generate response times.

## SUMMER CRIME ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM (2016)

### STATION/UNIT ALLOCATION (FY 16/17)

Fiscal Year: 16/17      Number of Weeks: 10

Station/Unit	DSG Items	B-1 Items	SGT Items	Total Items
Altadena	4	0	1	5
Carson	7	0	1	8
Century	10	0	2	12
Compton	4	0	1	5
Crescenta Valley	1	0	0	1
East Los Angeles	5	0	1	6
Industry	6	0	1	7
Lancaster	5	0	1	6
Lomita	2	0	1	3
Malibu/Lost Hills	2	0	0	2
Marina Del Rey	2	0	0	2
Palmdale	5	0	1	6
Pico Rivera	5	0	1	6
San Dimas	2	0	0	2
Santa Clarita	2	0	0	2
South Los Angeles	8	0	1	9
Temple	4	0	1	5
Walnut	2	0	0	2
West Hollywood	2	0	0	2
Operation Safe Streets	0	2	0	2
<b>Total:</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>93</b>





CYNTHIA A. HARDING, M.P.H.  
Interim Director

JEFFREY D. GUNZENHAUSER, M.D., M.P.H.  
Interim Health Officer

313 North Figueroa Street, Room 708  
Los Angeles, California 90012  
TEL (213) 240-8156 • FAX (213) 481-2739

[www.publichealth.lacounty.gov](http://www.publichealth.lacounty.gov)



**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Hilda L. Solis  
First District

Mark Ridley-Thomas  
Second District

Sheila Kuehl  
Third District

Don Knabe  
Fourth District

Michael D. Antonovich  
Fifth District

June 17, 2016

TO: Each Supervisor

FROM: Cynthia A. Harding, M.P.H.  
Interim Director

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Cynthia A. Harding". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped "H" and "A".

SUBJECT: **TRAUMA PREVENTION INITIATIVE SPENDING PLAN**

On December 8, 2015, your Board instructed the Department of Health Services to work with the Department of Public Health to develop and implement a trauma prevention initiative in regions of the County that experience a disproportionately high incidence of trauma. On April 12, 2016, by motion of Supervisor Ridley-Thomas, the Department of Public Health (DPH) was further instructed to report back with a proposed spending plan to implement the trauma prevention initiative that includes information on how the funds will be allocated for each element of the plan and what portion of the funds will be allocated to community based organizations to support trauma prevention activities.

DPH, in partnership with DHS, has begun to develop and implement the County Trauma Prevention Initiative (Initiative) utilizing the annual amount of \$685,000 of Measure B funding included in the Chief Executive Office's Recommended Budget for Fiscal Years 2015-16 and 2016-17. While the Initiative will initially prioritize areas of the County that experience a disproportionately high burden of violence-related trauma, promising practices and lessons learned from this initial work can also be scaled up for County-wide implementation. The Initiative will maximize the reach of Measure B funds by aligning with other ongoing community efforts to reduce trauma and violence in the identified areas.

The Initiative plan outlines how funds will be allocated for various components, and prioritizes efforts in two to three communities in South Los Angeles with the highest burden of violence-related trauma visits, injuries, and deaths. A majority of the funding for the two fiscal years (72%) will support community-level strategies to reduce violence, with 39% going directly to supporting community-based organizations. Program strategies will include evidence-based and practice-tested interventions that address focus areas such as violence interruption, safe passages, case management and referral for mental health and social services, trauma-informed care, and coordinated services for families.

## A. Proposed Spending Plan

Category	Fiscal Year 2015-2016 <sup>a</sup>	Fiscal Year 2016-2017 <sup>b</sup>
Community-based strategies for case management of individuals exposed to violence	----	\$529,446
Parks After Dark program expansion	\$194,000	\$194,000
Strategic planning with community stakeholders	----	\$75,900
Violence surveillance (abstraction of law enforcement data and management of data from the Violent Death Reporting System)	\$5,000	\$24,000
Personnel (Project Coordinator, Research Analyst)	\$22,024	\$282,741
Operating expenses (computers, office space, travel/mileage, communications, supplies, etc.)	\$15,750	\$27,139
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>\$236,774</b>	<b>\$1,133,226</b>

<sup>a</sup> Total allocation for FY15-16 is \$685,000; unobligated amount of \$448,226 to be rolled over to FY16-17.

<sup>b</sup> Total allocation for FY16-17 is \$685,000; overall total for this fiscal year (with the rollover amount) will be \$1,133,226.

## B. Budget Narrative

### Community-based strategies for case management of individuals exposed to violence

Use of community intervention workers (CIWs) to assist gang-involved and at-risk youth and adults can serve as an important approach to engaging individuals exposed to violence who are otherwise not easily identified in the clinical setting. CIWs can help mediate conflicts, ensure safe passage to and from parks, schools, and public places, and facilitate connections to school-based services, work source centers, mental health services, substance abuse treatment programs, and domestic violence prevention and management resources.

Similarly, interventions that connect patients who are recently admitted to a hospital for treatment of a serious violence-related injury with case managers who can provide linkages and referrals to community-based resources such as mental health services, job placement, court advocacy, and housing, represent another approach in which individuals exposed to violence or violence-related trauma can access assistance. Both types of community strategies are based on emerging practices in the field of violence-related trauma prevention. Efforts are underway to identify and work with community-based organizations (CBOs) that can carry out this work. Through competitive solicitation using purchase orders and work orders in FY16-17, DPH intends to fund CBOs to implement these types of interventions in the community.

### Parks After Dark program expansion

Funding will be used to expand and maintain the Parks After Dark (PAD) Program in four additional parks in South Los Angeles: Athens Park (Willowbrook), Helen Keller Park (Westmont), Bethune Park (Florence-Graham), and East Rancho Dominguez Park (Compton).



Funded activities will include the PAD events, development and implementation of a marketing plan to increase park usage, and coordination of health outreach programming from DPH's Community Health Services and other Health Agency divisions and programs. This funding allocation leverages the Department of Parks and Recreation's concurrent effort to expand PAD to 8 other parks across the county. Presently, there are 9 PAD parks. By the end of 2016, there will be a total of 21 parks with PAD programming. To carry out this expansion, DPH is in the process of completing a Memorandum of Understanding and a Departmental Service Order with the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). DPR will manage the expansion activities, including programming, at the four additional PAD parks.

Prior evaluations of PAD suggest that this program collaboration between DPR, DPH, the Sheriff's Department, and community organizations improves social cohesion, increases physical activity among residents, and contributes to reductions in crimes/violence in target communities. PAD also offers residents potential access to health, mental health, and social services that are available at the PAD events.

#### **Strategic planning with community stakeholders**

Funding will be used to hire a strategic planning group or coalition to convene community leaders and stakeholders in South Los Angeles. Among the goals of this effort will be to identify and work with community champions and advisors, develop an action plan that can be used to inform the selection and implementation of community-based strategies that align with the Initiative including the PAD expansion, and coordinate non-Measure B efforts to avoid duplication of services and to leverage existing resources in the community.

#### **Violence surveillance**

Funding is required to abstract data from sources such as the Violent Death Reporting System and the Sheriff's Department. The latter, law enforcement data, is particularly important for tracking violent events and crimes over time; these are indicators that can be used to monitor whether the Initiative and other violence prevention efforts in a target community are potentially making an impact. To cover the costs of abstracting and managing law enforcement data, DPH is in the process of completing a Memorandum of Understanding and Departmental Service Order with the Sheriff's Department.

#### **Personnel**

##### Project Coordinator, Trauma Prevention Initiative (1 FTE)

The Project Coordinator will oversee all aspects of the Initiative, including supervising the Research Analyst and overseeing the daily operations related to the Initiative's activities in target communities and at Parks After Dark (PAD) parks. Working closely with the Injury and Violence Prevention Program, the Project Coordinator will also help coordinate with non-Measure B trauma prevention efforts at local trauma centers and across the Departments of Health Services, Mental Health, and Public Health.

##### Research Analyst, Trauma Prevention Initiative (1 FTE)

The Research Analyst will oversee surveillance activities for the Initiative. These activities will include collecting and analyzing Emergency Medical Services (EMS) data to better understand the patterns of violence-related trauma visits in Los Angeles County. Such community-level

Each Supervisor

June 17, 2016

Page 4

surveillance will allow EMS, DPH, and other agencies to better identify and prioritize community “hotspots” and high-risk populations where services and interventions are needed. Data on these community “hotspots”, in turn, can inform planning and programming for these high needs areas. Surveillance under the Initiative will also track changes in key metrics, such as whether violence-related trauma visits declined over time.

**Operating expenses**

Funding for operating costs such as computers and software for the Project Coordinator and Research Analyst, office space, travel and mileage, communications (e.g., phones), and office supplies supports implementation of the Initiative.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please let me know.

CAH:tk

c: Chief Executive Officer  
County Counsel  
Executive Officer, Board of Supervisor





## County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration  
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012  
(213) 974-1101  
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

SACHI A. HAMAI  
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors  
HILDA L. SOLIS  
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS  
Second District

SHEILA KUEHL  
Third District

DON KNABE  
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH  
Fifth District

September 27, 2016

To: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, Chair  
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas  
Supervisor Sheila Kuehl  
Supervisor Don Knabe  
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: Sachi A. Hamai  
Chief Executive Officer

### **ARTS FOR ALL PROGRAM REPORT BACK (ITEM NO. 50-C, AGENDA OF APRIL 12, 2016)**

On April 12, 2016, on a motion by Supervisor Knabe, the Chief Executive Officer was instructed to report back to the Board at the Supplemental Budget meeting on how to fund an increase to the Arts for All Program (Program), including the Probation Camps.

The Program has grown significantly since its inception in 2007. The primary funding source for the Program has been from contributions from various foundations and corporations. Through successful fundraising efforts, there are currently over 30 foundations and corporate sponsors contributing to the Program. In order to demonstrate the County's continued commitment and support, our Office has identified and provided \$100,000 for the FY 2016-17 Adopted Budget. This brings the County's contribution for the core Program to \$324,000, an approximately 45% increase over the previous allocation. This additional County funding will also assist the Arts Commission by providing additional leverage in their fundraising efforts.

Over the past year, the Arts Commission has been collaborating with the Probation Department and the Arts for Incarcerated Youth Network to field test implementation models for embedding the arts in juvenile justice reform efforts. Currently, the Probation Department provides sufficient funding to provide arts instruction to youth at seven Los Angeles County Probation Camps (Afflerbaugh, David Gonzalez, McNair, Onizuka, Glenn Rockey, Joseph Scott and Kenyon Scudder), two Juvenile Halls (Barry J. Nidorf and Central), and to initiate year-long after school arts instruction at six juvenile Day

*"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"*

**Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are Two-Sided  
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only**

Each Supervisor  
September 27, 2016  
Page 2

Reporting Centers across the County. In addition, the Arts Commission is working with the Department of Mental Health to restore and coordinate arts programming provided at Probation facilities. The Arts Commission will continue to work with partners to expand the services for incarcerated youth and will seek Board's approval for funding increases as service and funding levels are worked out.

If you have any questions, please have your staff contact James Yun at (213) 974-1168 or at [jyun@ceo.lacounty.gov](mailto:jyun@ceo.lacounty.gov).

SAH:JJ:SK  
SW:GS:JY:cg

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors  
County Counsel  
Arts Commission

K:\Board Memos\CEO Board Memos Word\09.27.16 Arts For All Program Report Back (4.12.16 Agenda Item 50-C).Docx